arXiv:0811.1357v4 [math-ph] 7 Aug 2009

Spinor fields without Lorentz frames in curved spacetime using complexified quaternions

John Fredsted*
Soeskraenten 22, Stavtrup, DK-8260 Viby J., Denmark

August 7, 2009

Abstract

Using complexified quaternions, a formalism without Lorentz frames, and therefore also without vierbeins, for dealing with tensor and spinor fields in curved spacetime is presented. A local $\mathrm{U}(1)$ gauge symmetry, which, it is speculated, might be related to electromagnetism, emerges naturally.

1 Introduction

Originating from the papers by Fock and Ivanenko [1], and Weyl [2], the standard formulation [3, 4, 5] of spinor fields in curved spacetime employs a vierbein field ${e^a}_\mu$ which erects at each point in spacetime a local Lorentz frame. Using complexified quaternions, this paper will present a coordinate covariant and locally Lorentz invariant formalism for spinor fields in curved spacetime using no local Lorentz frames.

In general relativity which is our current best theory of the dynamics of curved spacetime, the fundamental structures are the basis $\mathbf{e}_\mu \in TM$, which may or may not be a coordinate basis ∂_μ, the dual 1-form basis $\boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu \in T^*M$ obeying $\delta^\mu_\nu \equiv \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu, \mathbf{e}_\nu \rangle$, the metric $\mathbf{g}$ with components $g_{\mu\nu} \equiv \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{e}_\mu, \mathbf{e}_\nu) \equiv \mathbf{e}_\mu \cdot \mathbf{e}_\nu$, and the connection coefficients ${\Gamma^\mu}_{\nu\rho} \equiv \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu, \nabla_\rho \mathbf{e}_\nu \rangle$ with ∇_ρ the covariant derivative [6]. For dealing with spinor fields, this structure is augmented by a vierbein field ${e^a}_\mu$, as previously mentioned, obeying $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{ab} {e^a}_\mu {e^b}_\nu$, where η_{ab} is the Minkowski metric, and a spin connection ${\omega_\mu}^{ab}$ which in its minimal version is given by ${\omega_\mu}^{ab} \equiv g^{\rho\sigma} {e^a}_\rho \nabla_\mu {e^b}_\sigma$ [4].

This paper will present a formalism able of dealing with both tensor and spinor fields, using much less structure (see the next section for the notation): a basis $\mathrm{s}_\mu \in (\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H})^-$ and a spin connection $\omega_\mu \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H}$ obeying $0 = \mathrm{Scal}\left(\omega_\mu + \overline{\varpi}^*_\mu\right)$, Eq. (27), in terms of which both the metric and the 'minimal version', to be specified later, of the connection

---

[*] physics@johnfredsted.dk

coefficients are determined as $g_{\mu\nu} \equiv \langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu \rangle$, Eq. (2), and $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} \equiv \left\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \partial_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle$, Eq. (26), respectively.

The condition $0 = \mathrm{Scal}\left(\omega_\mu + \overline{\omega}^*_\mu\right)$ is equivalent to $\omega_\mu \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R} \vee \omega_\mu \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathrm{Vec}\,(\mathbb{H})$. The freedom $\omega_\mu \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$ is related to a local $\mathrm{U}\,(1)$ gauge freedom, Eq. (29), which, it is speculated, might be related to electromagnetism.

2 Notation

The set of complexified quaternions is denoted $\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H}$, which is equal to $\mathbb{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ because $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbb{H}$ are assumed to commute. Usual complex conjugation acts as $\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{C}^* \otimes \mathbb{H}$, and usual quaternionic conjugation [7, 8] acts as $\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{C} \otimes \overline{\mathbb{H}}$. In conjunction, these two conjugations may be used to split the complexified quaternions as $\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H} = (\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H})^- \cup (\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H})^+$, where

$$(\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H})^\pm \equiv \left\{ x \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H} \,|\, \overline{x}^* = \pm x \right\}.$$

The real- and imaginary parts of $\mathbb{C}$ are, as usual, denoted $\mathrm{Re}\,(\mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathrm{Im}\,(\mathbb{C}) = \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, respectively. The scalar- and vector parts of $\mathbb{H}$, denoted $\mathrm{Scal}\,(\mathbb{H})$ and $\mathrm{Vec}\,(\mathbb{H})$, respectively, are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Scal}\,(\mathbb{H}) &\equiv \left\{ x \in \mathbb{H} \,|\, \overline{x} = +x \right\}, \\ \mathrm{Vec}\,(\mathbb{H}) &\equiv \left\{ x \in \mathbb{H} \,|\, \overline{x} = -x \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The bilinear inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : (\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H})^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ is defined as [9]

$$2 \langle x, y \rangle \equiv x\overline{y} + y\overline{x} \equiv \overline{x}y + \overline{y}x. \tag{1}$$

3 Basis and metric

Let (M, x^μ) be some spacetime four-manifold M parametrized by some coordinate system x^μ. In order to endow M with a measure of distance, a metric $g_{\mu\nu} \in \mathbb{R}$ must be provided. For M a Riemannian manifold, the metric is given by $g_{\mu\nu} \equiv \mathbf{g}\left(\mathbf{e}_\mu, \mathbf{e}_\nu\right)$ with $\mathbf{g} \equiv g_{\mu\nu} \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu \otimes \boldsymbol{\omega}^\nu$, where $\mathbf{e}_\mu \in TM$ is the basis, and $\boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu \in T^*M$ is the dual 1-form basis, obeying $\delta^\mu_\nu = \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu, \mathbf{e}_\nu \rangle$ [6].

This route will not be taken in this paper: neither a basis $\mathbf{e}_\mu \in TM$ nor a dual 1-form basis $\boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu \in T^*M$ will be introduced, thus leaving the arena of Riemannian manifolds. Instead the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ will be given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} \ni 2g_{\mu\nu} &\equiv 2 \langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu \rangle \\ &\equiv \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu \\ &\equiv \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu \mathrm{s}_\nu + \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu \mathrm{s}_\mu, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

with $\mathrm{s}_\mu = -\overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu^* \in (\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})^-$ the basis obeying the nondegeneracy condition

$$\{c^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu \,|c^\mu \in \mathbb{C}\} = \mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}. \tag{3}$$

A basis $\mathrm{s}_\mu = +\overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu^* \in (\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})^+$, corresponding to the opposite signature of the metric, could, of course, equally well have been chosen. The real-valuedness of the metric, as indicated above, is a direct consequence of Proposition 4. The symmetry of the metric follows trivially from the symmetry of the inner product, $\langle x, y\rangle \equiv \langle y, x\rangle$.

The nondegeneracy property of s_μ, as stated above, implies the nondegeneracy of the metric, i.e., $\det(g_{\mu\nu}) \neq 0$, as follows: Assume that $\{c^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu \,|c^\mu \in \mathbb{C}\} = \mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$, but $\det(g_{\mu\nu}) = 0$. Then, performing matrix row operations, there must exist some linear combination $d^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu$, with $d^\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, so that $\langle d^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle = 0$ for all s_ν, which implies that $d^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu = 0$, which implies that $\dim(\{c^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu \,|c^\mu \in \mathbb{C}\}) < \dim(\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})$. A contradiction.

The nondegeneracy of the metric allows the definition $\mathrm{s}^\mu \equiv g^{\mu\nu}\mathrm{s}_\nu \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{s}_\mu = g_{\mu\nu}\mathrm{s}^\nu$, which, unsurprisingly, obeys $\delta^\mu_\nu = \langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle$ and $g^{\mu\nu} = \langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \mathrm{s}^\nu\rangle$. Thus, as usual, coordinate indices are raised and lowered with the inverse metric and the metric, respectively. Note that $\delta^\mu_\nu = \langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle$ may be considered the analogue of $\delta^\mu_\nu = \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu, \mathbf{e}_\nu\rangle$ in Riemannian calculus, but whereas it is quite sensible to raise and lower indices in $\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle$, it is not in $\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu, \mathbf{e}_\nu\rangle$, because $\mathbf{e}_\mu$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu$ are *fixed* as type $(0,1)$ and $(1,0)$ tensors, respectively.

The basis s_μ is subject to two different types of transformations:

- Coordinate transformations: In accordance with its coordinate index μ, under a coordinate transformation $dx'^\mu = (\partial x'^\mu/\partial x^\nu)\, dx^\nu$, the basis s_μ is assumed to transform as a type $(0,1)$ tensor, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{s}'_\mu = \frac{\partial x^\nu}{\partial x'^\mu}\mathrm{s}_\nu, \tag{4}$$

  thus making $g_{\mu\nu}$ and s^μ transform as type $(0,2)$ and type $(1,0)$ tensors, respectively.

- Local Lorentz transformations: Under the local transformation $\mathrm{s}'_\mu = \Lambda \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\Lambda}^*$, where $\Lambda \equiv \Lambda(x^\mu)$ obeys $\overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda^{-1} \Leftrightarrow 1 = \Lambda\overline{\Lambda} = \overline{\Lambda}\Lambda$, the metric is invariant as the following calculation, using some of the identities of Proposition 3, shows:

$$\begin{aligned} g'_{\mu\nu} &= \left\langle \Lambda \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\Lambda}^*, \Lambda \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\Lambda}^* \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \left(\overline{\Lambda}\Lambda\right) \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu \left(\overline{\Lambda}\Lambda\right)^* \right\rangle \\ &= g_{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

  Note that $\mathrm{s}_\mu \to \mathrm{s}'_\mu = \Lambda \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\Lambda}^*$ maps, as it should, from $(\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})^-$ to $(\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})^-$. The associativity of the (complexified) quaternions makes it unnecessary to care about parantheses in the calculation. The group

$$\left\langle \left\{\Lambda \in \mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H} \,\middle|\overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda^{-1}\right\}, \times, 1\right\rangle$$

with multiplication × as group operation, and 1 as identity element is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sp}\left(1,\mathbb{C}\right)\cong\mathrm{SL}\left(2,\mathbb{C}\right)$, the double cover of the Lorentz group $\mathrm{SO}\left(3,1\right)$. Therefore, the transformation $\mathrm{s}'_\mu=\Lambda\mathrm{s}_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^*$ is a proper Lorentz transformation [10].

4 Covariant derivative and connections

Under the local Lorentz transformation $\mathrm{s}'_\mu=\Lambda\mathrm{s}_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^*$, the derivative $\partial_\mu\mathrm{s}_\nu$ transforms non-covariantly, i.e., $\left(\partial_\mu\mathrm{s}_\nu\right)'\neq\Lambda\left(\partial_\mu\mathrm{s}_\nu\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*$, generally. The remedy, as usual, is to define a covariant derivative D_μ for which $\left(D_\mu\mathrm{s}_\nu\right)'=\Lambda\left(D_\mu\mathrm{s}_\nu\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*$. Preferably, D_μ should commute with both complex- and quaternionic conjugation, i.e.,

$$D_\mu\phi^* \equiv \left(D_\mu\phi\right)^*, \tag{6}$$

$$D_\mu\overline{\phi} \equiv \overline{\left(D_\mu\phi\right)}, \tag{7}$$

for all fields $\phi\in\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$ (any coordinate indices suppressed). Before defining the covariant derivative of s_μ, the socalled quaternionic spinor fields, quaternionic vector field, and quaternionic scalar field, and their covariant derivatives, will be defined.

4.1 Quaternionic spinor fields

Fields $\psi_L,\psi_R\in\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$ that transform as $\psi'_L=\Lambda\psi_L$ and $\psi'_R=\psi_R\overline{\Lambda}^*$, respectively, will be called *quaternionic spinor fields.* Their covariant derivatives are defined as

$$D_\mu\psi_L \equiv \partial_\mu\psi_L+\omega_\mu\psi_L, \tag{8}$$

$$D_\mu\psi_R \equiv \partial_\mu\psi_R+\psi_R\overline{\omega}^*_\mu, \tag{9}$$

where $\omega_\mu\in\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$ is some gauge connection obeying $0=\mathrm{Scal}\left(\omega_\mu+\overline{\omega}^*_\mu\right)$, a condition which will become clear shortly.

Proposition 1 *The covariant derivatives $D_\mu\psi_L$ and $D_\mu\psi_R$ transform covariantly,*

$$\left(D_\mu\psi_L\right)' = \Lambda\left(D_\mu\psi_L\right), \tag{10}$$

$$\left(D_\mu\psi_R\right)' = \left(D_\mu\psi_R\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*, \tag{11}$$

if and only if the gauge connection ω_μ transforms as

$$\omega'_\mu=\Lambda\omega_\mu\overline{\Lambda}-\left(\partial_\mu\Lambda\right)\overline{\Lambda}. \tag{12}$$

Proof: By direct calculation follows

$$\begin{aligned}\left(D_\mu\psi_L\right)' &= \left(\partial_\mu\Lambda\right)\psi_L+\Lambda\left(\partial_\mu\psi_L\right)+\omega'_\mu\left(\Lambda\psi_L\right),\\ \left(D_\mu\psi_R\right)' &= \left(\partial_\mu\psi_R\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*+\psi_R\left(\partial_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^*\right)+\left(\psi_R\overline{\Lambda}^*\right)\overline{\left(\omega'_\mu\right)}^*,\end{aligned}$$

which equal $\Lambda\left(D_\mu\psi_L\right)$ and $\left(D_\mu\psi_R\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*$, respectively, if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\partial_\mu\Lambda\right)\psi_L+\omega'_\mu\left(\Lambda\psi_L\right) &= \Lambda\left(\omega_\mu\psi_L\right),\\ \psi_R\left(\partial_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^*\right)+\left(\psi_R\overline{\Lambda}^*\right)\overline{\left(\omega'_\mu\right)}^* &= \left(\psi_R\overline{\omega}^*_\mu\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*,\end{aligned}$$

which, using the associativity of the complexified quaternions to move parantheses, the arbitrariness of ψ_L and ψ_R, and $\overline{\Lambda}=\Lambda^{-1}$, imply the two equivalent conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\omega'_\mu &= \Lambda\omega_\mu\overline{\Lambda}-\left(\partial_\mu\Lambda\right)\overline{\Lambda},\\ \overline{\left(\omega'_\mu\right)}^* &= \Lambda^*\overline{\omega}^*_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^*-\Lambda^*\left(\partial_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^*\right).\end{aligned}$$

■

Generally, fields $L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}, R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\in\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$ that transform as $\left(L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)'=\Lambda L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}$ and $\left(R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)'=R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\overline{\Lambda}^*$, respectively, will be called *type* (m,n) *tensor-valued quaternionic spinor fields.* The covariant derivative of these fields are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}D_\mu L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n} &\equiv \nabla_\mu L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}+\omega_\mu L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}, &(13)\\ D_\mu R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n} &\equiv \nabla_\mu R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}+R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\overline{\omega}^*_\mu. &(14)\end{aligned}$$

In comparison with $D_\mu\psi_L$ and $D_\mu\psi_R$, above, note here the explicit appearance of ∇_μ, which is necessary because the quaternionic spinor fields $L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}$ and $R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}$ now carry coordinate indices. They transform covariantly;

$$\begin{aligned}\left(D_\mu L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)' &= \Lambda\left(D_\mu L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right), &(15)\\ \left(D_\mu R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)' &= \left(D_\mu R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*, &(16)\end{aligned}$$

the proof of which is completely analogous to the proof above for $D_\mu\psi_L$ and $D_\mu\psi_R$. The above fields ψ_L and ψ_R are, of course, type $(0,0)$ tensor-valued quaternionic spinor fields.

4.2 Quaternionic vector field

A field $V\in\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$ that transforms as $V'=\Lambda V\overline{\Lambda}^*$ will be called a *quaternionic vector field.* Its covariant derivative is defined as

$$D_\mu V\equiv\partial_\mu V+\omega_\mu V+V\overline{\omega}^*_\mu. \tag{17}$$

Proposition 2 *The covariant derivative $D_\mu V$ transforms covariantly,*

$$\left(D_\mu V\right)'=\Lambda\left(D_\mu V\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*. \tag{18}$$

Proof: Follows by direct calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}
(D_\mu V)' &\equiv \partial_\mu V' + \omega'_\mu V' + V'\overline{(\omega'_\mu)}^* \\
&= \partial_\mu\left(\Lambda V\overline{\Lambda}^*\right) \\
&\quad + \left[\Lambda\omega_\mu\overline{\Lambda} - (\partial_\mu\Lambda)\overline{\Lambda}\right]\left(\Lambda V\overline{\Lambda}^*\right) \\
&\quad + \left(\Lambda V\overline{\Lambda}^*\right)\left[\Lambda^*\varpi^*_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda^*\left(\partial_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^*\right)\right] \\
&= (\partial_\mu\Lambda)V\overline{\Lambda}^* + \Lambda(\partial_\mu V)\overline{\Lambda}^* + \Lambda V\left(\partial_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^*\right) \\
&\quad +\Lambda\omega_\mu\left(\overline{\Lambda}\Lambda\right)V\overline{\Lambda}^* - (\partial_\mu\Lambda)\left(\overline{\Lambda}\Lambda\right)V\overline{\Lambda}^* \\
&\quad +\Lambda V\left(\overline{\Lambda}^*\Lambda^*\right)\varpi^*_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda V\left(\overline{\Lambda}^*\Lambda^*\right)\left(\partial_\mu\overline{\Lambda}^*\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which, using $1 = \overline{\Lambda}\Lambda = \overline{\Lambda}^*\Lambda^*$, implies

$$(D_\mu V)' = \Lambda\left(\partial_\mu V + \omega_\mu V + V\varpi^*_\mu\right)\overline{\Lambda}^* = \Lambda\left(D_\mu V\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*.$$

■

Generally, a field $V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n} \in \mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$ that transform as $\left(V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)' = \Lambda V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\overline{\Lambda}^*$ will be called a *type (m,n) tensor-valued quaternionic vector field.* The covariant derivative of this field is defined as

$$D_\mu V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n} = \nabla_\mu V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n} + \omega_\mu V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n} + V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\varpi^*_\mu. \tag{19}$$

Analogous to $D_\mu L^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}$ and $D_\mu R^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}$, above, ∇_μ is necessary here because the quaternionic vector field $V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}$ now carry coordinate indices. It transforms covariantly;

$$\left(D_\mu V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)' = \Lambda\left(D_\mu V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)\overline{\Lambda}^*, \tag{20}$$

the proof of which is completely analogous to the proof above for $D_\mu V$. The above field V is, of course, a type $(0,0)$ tensor-valued quaternionic vector field.

4.3 Quaternionic scalar field

A field $S \in \mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$ that transforms invariantly, $S' = S$, will be called a *quaternionic scalar field.* Its covariant derivative is defined as

$$D_\mu S \equiv \partial_\mu S. \tag{21}$$

Generally, a field $S^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n} \in \mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$ that transform as $\left(S^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)' = S^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}$ will be called a *type (m,n) tensor-valued quaternionic scalar field.* The covariant derivative of this field is defined as

$$D_\mu S^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n} = \nabla_\mu S^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}. \tag{22}$$

Analogous to $D_\mu V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}$, above, ∇_μ is necessary here because the quaternionic scalar field $S^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}$ now carry coordinate indices. It transforms covariantly (and invariantly);

$$\left(D_\mu S^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\right)' = D_\mu S^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}. \tag{23}$$

The above field S is, of course, a type $(0,0)$ tensor-valued quaternionic scalar field.

4.4 Basis and metric

The basis field s_μ is a type $(0,1)$ tensor-valued quaternionic vector field, so according to Eq. (19) its covariant derivative is defined as

$$D_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu \equiv \nabla_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho. \tag{24}$$

In complete analogy with how ∇_ρ acts in Riemannian calculus, the covariant derivative $\nabla_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu$ is defined as

$$\nabla_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu \equiv \partial_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu - \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} \mathrm{s}_\mu, \tag{25}$$

where $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$ are connection coefficients which couple, in the usual way, to any coordinate index, covariant or contravariant. Note, however, that a priori $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$ have nothing to do with the usual connection coefficients $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} \equiv \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu, \nabla_\rho \mathbf{e}_\nu \rangle$ of Riemannian calculus, because, as previously stated, neither the basis $\mathbf{e}_\mu \in TM$ nor the dual 1-form basis $\boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu \in T^*M$ is provided in the present formalism.

So, as of yet, $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$ are undetermined. A 'minimal version' of $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$, in the spirit of a minimal spin connection [4, 5], can be determined by solving the 'minimality condition' $0 \equiv D_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu$ for $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} = \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}(\mathrm{s}_\sigma, \omega_\sigma)$, the result being

$$\mathbb{R} \ni \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} \equiv \left\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \partial_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle. \tag{26}$$

Expressing $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$ in terms of s_μ and ω_μ, which is somehow the reverse of expressing a minimal spin connection $\omega_\mu{}^{ab}$ in terms of a vierbein $e^a{}_\mu$ and the connection coefficients $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$, as is customarily done [4, 5], is reasonable because with neither $\mathbf{e}_\mu \in TM$ nor $\boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu \in T^*M$ provided in the present formalism, the connection coefficients seem to 'flap in the breeze': the only potentially reasonable way, it seems, that they could be expressed without using ω_μ is as the usual Christoffel coefficients,

$$\left\{ {\rho \atop \mu\nu} \right\} \equiv \frac{1}{2} g^{\rho\sigma} \left(\partial_\mu g_{\sigma\nu} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\sigma} - \partial_\sigma g_{\mu\nu} \right),$$

determined entirely in terms of the metric $g_{\mu\nu} = \langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu \rangle$. But, remembering that the Christoffel connection coefficients are the (general) connection coefficients in a coordinate basis $\mathbf{e}_\mu = \partial_\mu$, why should $\Gamma^\rho{}_{\mu\nu}$, as defined by Eq. (26), equal $\left\{ {\rho \atop \mu\nu} \right\}$, when there is no relation between the coordinate system x^μ and the basis s_μ?

Four important properties of $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$, as defined by Eq. (26), should be emphasized:

- Its real-valuedness, as indicated above: This follows directly from $\mathrm{s}^\mu \in (\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})^-$ and $\partial_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \in (\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})^-$, using Proposition 4.

- Its metric compatibility in the usual Riemannian sense, $0 \equiv \nabla_\rho g_{\mu\nu}$: Follows by direct calculation, using some of the identities of Proposition 3:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_\rho g_{\mu\nu} &\equiv \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu} - \Gamma^\sigma{}_{\mu\rho} g_{\sigma\nu} - \Gamma^\sigma{}_{\nu\rho} g_{\mu\sigma} \\
&= \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu} - \left\langle \mathrm{s}^\sigma, \partial_\rho \mathrm{s}_\mu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\mu + \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle g_{\sigma\nu} - \left\langle \mathrm{s}^\sigma, \partial_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle g_{\mu\sigma} \\
&= -\left\langle \mathrm{s}_\nu, \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\mu \right\rangle - \left\langle \mathrm{s}_\nu, \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle - \left\langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu \right\rangle - \left\langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle \\
&= -\left\langle \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu, \omega_\rho \right\rangle - \left\langle \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu \mathrm{s}_\nu, \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle - \left\langle \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu, \omega_\rho \right\rangle - \left\langle \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu \mathrm{s}_\mu, \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle \\
&= -\left\langle \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu, \omega_\rho \right\rangle - \left\langle \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu \mathrm{s}_\nu + \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu \mathrm{s}_\mu, \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle \\
&= -2 g_{\mu\nu} \left\langle 1, \omega_\rho + \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \right\rangle \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

  where the last equality follows because

$$0 = \mathrm{Scal}\left(\omega_\mu + \overline{\omega}^*_\mu\right) \Leftrightarrow \omega_\mu \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R} \vee \omega_\mu \in \mathbb{C}\otimes\mathrm{Vec}\left(\mathbb{H}\right), \tag{27}$$

  a condition on ω_μ previously stated in connection with the definitions of the covariant derivatives of the quaternionic spinor fields, Eqs. (8) and (9).

- Its transformation under coordinate transformations: By direct calculation, using Eq. (26), and the fact that s_μ and ω_μ transform as type $(0,1)$ tensors, it follows that $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$ transform as the connection coefficients in Riemannian calculus do [6, Eq. (10.26)];

$$\left(\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}\right)' = \frac{\partial x'^\mu}{\partial x^\alpha}\frac{\partial x^\beta}{\partial x'^\nu}\frac{\partial x^\gamma}{\partial x'^\rho}\Gamma^\alpha{}_{\beta\gamma} + \frac{\partial x'^\mu}{\partial x^\alpha}\frac{\partial^2 x^\alpha}{\partial x'^\nu \partial x'^\rho}.$$

- Its invariance under local Lorentz transformations: The basis s_μ and the gauge connection ω_μ transform as $\mathrm{s}'_\mu = \Lambda \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\Lambda}^*$ and $\omega'_\mu = \Lambda \omega_\mu \overline{\Lambda} - \left(\partial_\mu \Lambda\right)\overline{\Lambda}$, respectively, where $\overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda^{-1}$. Using these relations and some of the identities of Proposition 3, the claim follows by direct calculation.

Note that $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$, as defined by Eq. (26), need *not* be symmetric in its lower two indices, as the Christoffel coefficients are.

Because the metric transforms invariantly, compare Eq. (5), according to Eq. (22), the covariant derivative $D_\rho g_{\mu\nu}$ should equal $\nabla_\rho g_{\mu\nu}$. This is, indeed, verified by the following explicit calculation, analogous to the above proof of $0 \equiv \nabla_\rho g_{\mu\nu}$, using Eqs. (7), (24), and

(27), as well as some of the identities of Proposition 3:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\rho g_{\mu\nu} &= \langle D_\rho \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle + \langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, D_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \nabla_\rho \mathrm{s}_\mu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\mu + \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho, \mathrm{s}_\nu\right\rangle + \left\langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \nabla_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho\right\rangle \\
&= \nabla_\rho \langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle + \langle \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle + \left\langle \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho, \mathrm{s}_\nu\right\rangle + \langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle + \left\langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho\right\rangle \\
&= \nabla_\rho \langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle + \langle \omega_\rho, \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu\rangle + \left\langle \overline{\omega}^*_\rho, \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu \mathrm{s}_\nu\right\rangle + \langle \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu, \omega_\rho\rangle + \left\langle \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu \mathrm{s}_\mu, \overline{\omega}^*_\rho\right\rangle \\
&= \nabla_\rho \langle \mathrm{s}_\mu, \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle + \langle \omega_\rho, \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu\rangle + \left\langle \overline{\omega}^*_\rho, \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\mu \mathrm{s}_\nu + \overline{\mathrm{s}}_\nu \mathrm{s}_\mu\right\rangle \\
&= \nabla_\rho g_{\mu\nu} + 2 g_{\mu\nu} \left\langle 1, \omega_\rho + \overline{\omega}^*_\rho\right\rangle \\
&= \nabla_\rho g_{\mu\nu}.
\end{aligned}$$

4.5 Various

A final comment, before ending this section: Consider a quaternionic vector field $V = V^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H}$, where $V^\mu \in \mathbb{C}$. The covariant derivative $D_\mu V$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\rho V &= \partial_\rho V + \omega_\rho V + V \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \\
&= \partial_\rho \left(V^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu\right) + \omega_\rho \left(V^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu\right) + \left(V^\mu \mathrm{s}_\mu\right) \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \\
&= \left(\partial_\rho V^\mu\right) \mathrm{s}_\mu + V^\mu \left(\partial_\rho \mathrm{s}_\mu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\mu + \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho\right) \\
&= \left(\partial_\rho V^\mu\right) \mathrm{s}_\mu + \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} V^\nu \mathrm{s}_\mu \\
&= \left(\partial_\rho V^\mu + \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} V^\nu\right) \mathrm{s}_\mu,
\end{aligned}$$

using Eq. (17), and Eq. (26) in the form $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} \mathrm{s}_\mu \equiv \partial_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \omega_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}^*_\rho$. This may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, D_\rho V\rangle &= \partial_\rho V^\mu + \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} V^\nu, \\
V^\mu &= \langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, V\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

which is completely analogous to the usual expression in Riemannian calculus for a vector field $\mathbf{V} = V^\mu \mathbf{e}_\mu$;

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu, \nabla_\rho \mathbf{V}\rangle &= \partial_\rho V^\mu + \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} V^\nu, \\
V^\mu &= \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu, \mathbf{V}\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

5 Field strength tensors

In analogy with the expression $R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma} \equiv \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^\mu, \left[\nabla_\rho, \nabla_\sigma\right] \mathbf{e}_\nu\rangle$ for the Riemannian curvature tensor (in a coordinate basis) [6, Sec. 11.3], the expression $\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \left[D_\rho, D_\sigma\right] \mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle$ is calculated, suspending for the moment the minimality condition $0 \equiv D_\mu \mathrm{s}_\nu$: Because $D_\mu \mathrm{s}_\nu$ is a quaternionic vector field, $D_\rho D_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu \equiv D_\rho \left(D_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu\right)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_\rho D_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu &= \nabla_\rho \left(D_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu\right) + \omega_\rho \left(D_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu\right) + \left(D_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu\right) \overline{\omega}^*_\rho \\ &= \nabla_\rho \left(\nabla_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu + \omega_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu + \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\omega}^*_\sigma\right) \\ &\quad + \omega_\rho \left(\nabla_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu + \omega_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu + \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\omega}^*_\sigma\right) \\ &\quad + \left(\nabla_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu + \omega_\sigma \mathrm{s}_\mu + \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\omega}^*_\sigma\right) \overline{\omega}^*_\rho, \end{aligned}$$

which implies, various terms cancelling due to antisymmetry (and associativity of the complexified quaternions),

$$\begin{aligned} \left[D_\rho, D_\sigma\right] \mathrm{s}_\mu &= \left[\nabla_\rho, \nabla_\sigma\right] \mathrm{s}_\mu \\ &\quad + \left(\nabla_\rho \omega_\sigma - \nabla_\sigma \omega_\rho + \left[\omega_\rho, \omega_\sigma\right]\right) \mathrm{s}_\mu \\ &\quad + \mathrm{s}_\mu \left(\nabla_\rho \overline{\omega}^*_\sigma - \nabla_\sigma \overline{\omega}^*_\rho - \left[\overline{\omega}^*_\rho, \overline{\omega}^*_\sigma\right]\right), \end{aligned}$$

which, using the identity $\left[\overline{x}^*, \overline{y}^*\right] \equiv -\overline{\left[x, y\right]}^*$, may be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \left[D_\rho, D_\sigma\right] \mathrm{s}_\mu &= \left[\nabla_\rho, \nabla_\sigma\right] \mathrm{s}_\mu + \Omega_{\rho\sigma} \mathrm{s}_\mu + \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\Omega}^*_{\rho\sigma}, \\ \Omega_{\rho\sigma} &\equiv \nabla_\rho \omega_\sigma - \nabla_\sigma \omega_\rho + \left[\omega_\rho, \omega_\sigma\right], \end{aligned}$$

with $\Omega_{\rho\sigma}$, seemingly, the field strength tensor corresponding to the gauge connection ω_μ. This result is analogous to the following result in General Relativity (augmented with a vierbein $e^a{}_\mu$ and a spin connection $\omega_\mu{}^a{}_b$, compare [11]):

$$\begin{aligned} \left[D_\rho, D_\sigma\right] e^a{}_\nu &= -R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma} e^a{}_\mu + F^a{}_{b\rho\sigma} e^b{}_\nu, \\ R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma} &\equiv \partial_\rho \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\sigma} - \partial_\sigma \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} + \Gamma^\mu{}_{\tau\rho} \Gamma^\tau{}_{\nu\sigma} - \Gamma^\mu{}_{\tau\sigma} \Gamma^\tau{}_{\nu\rho}, \\ F^a{}_{b\rho\sigma} &\equiv \partial_\rho \omega_\sigma{}^a{}_b - \partial_\sigma \omega_\rho{}^a{}_b + \omega_\rho{}^a{}_c \omega_\sigma{}^c{}_b - \omega_\sigma{}^a{}_c \omega_\rho{}^c{}_b, \end{aligned}$$

where $D_\rho e^a{}_\nu \equiv \partial_\rho e^a{}_\nu - \Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} e^a{}_\mu + \omega_\rho{}^a{}_b e^b{}_\nu$. Note that $\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \left[\nabla_\rho, \nabla_\sigma\right] \mathrm{s}_\nu \rangle \equiv R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma}\left(\Gamma\right)$, by way of Eq. (25), where, of course, the connection coefficients $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$ entering into $R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma}\left(\Gamma\right)$ are those defined in Eq. (26). If $0 \equiv D_\rho \mathrm{s}_\nu$, then

$$0 = \left[\nabla_\rho, \nabla_\sigma\right] \mathrm{s}_\mu + \Omega_{\rho\sigma} \mathrm{s}_\mu + \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\Omega}^*_{\rho\sigma}. \tag{28}$$

Decomposing the gauge connection as $\omega_\mu = \chi_\mu + \mathrm{i} g A_\mu$, where $\chi_\mu \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathrm{Vec}\left(\mathbb{H}\right)$ and $A_\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, in accordance with Eq. (27), and $g \in \mathbb{R}$ is some coupling constant, the field strength tensor decomposes as

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\mu\nu} &= K_{\mu\nu} + \mathrm{i} g F_{\mu\nu}, \\ K_{\mu\nu} &\equiv \nabla_\mu \chi_\nu - \nabla_\nu \chi_\mu + \left[\chi_\mu, \chi_\nu\right] \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathrm{Vec}\left(\mathbb{H}\right), \\ F_{\mu\nu} &\equiv \nabla_\mu A_\nu - \nabla_\nu A_\mu \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

because $A_\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ commutes with any element of $\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{H}$, and in particular with χ_μ (and itself). Note that $F_{\mu\nu}$ does *not*, as usual in a coordinate basis in Riemannian calculus, reduce to $\partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$, because the connection coefficients $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$, as given by Eq. (26), are in general not symmetric in the lower two indices.

6 Unsettled issues

Below are listed unsettled issues which, it is hoped, will be settled in the near future, either by the author himself, or by some reader of this paper:

- Local U (1) gauge transformation: It is quite tempting to interprete A_μ and $F_{\mu\nu}$ as the electromagnetic gauge connection and field strength tensor, respectively. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that under the following local U (1) gauge transformation,

  $$\begin{aligned} \omega'_\mu &= \omega_\mu - \mathrm{i}\partial_\mu\phi, && (29)\\ \psi'_L &= \exp\left(+\mathrm{i}\phi\right)\psi_L, && (30)\\ \psi'_R &= \exp\left(-\mathrm{i}\phi\right)\psi_R, && (31)\end{aligned}$$

  where $\phi \equiv \phi\left(x^\mu\right) \in \mathbb{R}$, consistent with Eq. (27), the covariant derivatives $D_\mu\psi_L$ and $D_\mu\psi_R$ transform covariantly;

  $$\begin{aligned} \left(D_\mu\psi_L\right)' &= \exp\left(+\mathrm{i}\phi\right)\left(D_\mu\psi_L\right),\\ \left(D_\mu\psi_R\right)' &= \exp\left(-\mathrm{i}\phi\right)\left(D_\mu\psi_R\right).\end{aligned}$$

  Interestingly, the local gauge transformation given in Eq. (29) does not affect the covariant derivatives of any (tensor-valued) quaternionic vector fields, because $\omega_\mu V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n} + V^{\rho_1\cdots\rho_m}_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_n}\overline{\omega}^*_\mu$ in Eq. (19) is left unchanged due to the complex conjugation in $\overline{\omega}^*_\mu$ [see also added note below]. So, if the hypothesis of interpreting A_μ and $F_{\mu\nu}$ as the electromagnetic gauge connection and field strength tensor, respectively, is correct, then at the level of (tensor-valued) complex quaternionic fields it seems that only spinor fields can be electrically charged. That, of course, flat out contradicts Nature, which does contain charged fundamental vector particles, the weak bosons $W^\pm$. However, it may be speculated that generalizing the formalism here presented from $\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H}$-valued fields to $\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{O}$-valued fields, where $\mathbb{O}$ is the set of octonions [7, 8, 9], which is indeed a very natural thing to contemplate because the quaternions can be embedded into the octonions in numerous ways, would give room for the existence of $W^\pm$: for instance, it might be speculated that these bosons are a consequence of interactions between a $(\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})$-part of $\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{O}$ and its complement $(\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{O})\setminus(\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})$. Also in favor of generalizing from quaternions to octonions is the 'threeness' of the Fano plane, compare [7, Fig. 1.1] or [12, Sec. 2.1], of the seven imaginary units of the octonions which, as also speculated by others, for instance [13], is quite suggestive with respect to the threeness of color, or the threeness of the family structure.

- Potential symmetry of ${\Gamma^\rho}_{\mu\nu}$: In analogy with the Christoffel coefficients of usual Riemannian calculus, it would be desirable to have ${\Gamma^\rho}_{\mu\nu} = {\Gamma^\rho}_{\nu\mu}$, because, for one thing, it would imply $\nabla_\mu A_\nu - \nabla_\nu A_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$. By way of Eqs. (3) and (26), it is equivalent to

$$\partial_\mu \mathrm{s}_\nu + \omega_\mu \mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\omega}_\mu^* = \partial_\nu \mathrm{s}_\mu + \omega_\nu \mathrm{s}_\mu + \mathrm{s}_\mu \overline{\omega}_\nu^*,$$

which relates the gauge connection ω_μ to the basis s_μ. As of yet, it has not been figured out how to solve this equation for $\omega_\mu = \omega_\mu(\mathrm{s}_\nu)$.

- Lagrangian: From Eq. (28) follows that

  $$0 = R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma}(\Gamma) + \left\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \Omega_{\rho\sigma}\mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu \overline{\Omega}^*_{\rho\sigma} \right\rangle,$$

  where the connection coefficients $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$ entering into $R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma}(\Gamma) \equiv \langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, [\nabla_\rho, \nabla_\sigma]\,\mathrm{s}_\nu\rangle$ are those defined in Eq. (26). Because $\Omega_{\rho\sigma}\mathrm{s}_\nu + \mathrm{s}_\nu\overline{\Omega}^*_{\rho\sigma} \in (\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})^-$, these components $R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma}(\Gamma)$ are real-valued, which, of course, also is evident from the real-valuedness of the connection coefficients $\Gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}$. On grounds of this relation, it may be speculated that a Lagrangian, analogous to the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian, could be defined as (with $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ some constant),

  $$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\kappa}L &= R^{\mu\nu}{}_{\mu\nu}(\Gamma) \\ &= -\left\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu, \Omega_{\mu\nu}\mathrm{s}^\nu + \mathrm{s}^\nu\overline{\Omega}^*_{\mu\nu}\right\rangle \\ &= -\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu\overline{\mathrm{s}}^\nu, \Omega_{\mu\nu}\rangle - \left\langle \overline{\mathrm{s}}^\nu\mathrm{s}^\mu, \overline{\Omega}^*_{\mu\nu}\right\rangle \\ &= -\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu\overline{\mathrm{s}}^\nu, \Omega_{\mu\nu}\rangle - \left\langle \mathrm{s}^\nu\overline{\mathrm{s}}^\mu, \overline{\Omega}_{\mu\nu}\right\rangle^* \\ &= -\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu\overline{\mathrm{s}}^\nu, \Omega_{\mu\nu}\rangle - \langle \mathrm{s}^\mu\overline{\mathrm{s}}^\nu, \Omega_{\mu\nu}\rangle^* \\ &= -2\,\mathrm{Re}\left(\langle \mathrm{s}^\mu\overline{\mathrm{s}}^\nu, \Omega_{\mu\nu}\rangle\right), \end{aligned}$$

  using $\overline{\mathrm{s}}^*_\mu = -\mathrm{s}_\mu$, and some of the identities of Proposition 3. However, in regards to the former hypothesis of interpreting A_μ and $F_{\mu\nu}$ as the electromagnetic gauge connection and field strength tensor, respectively, this Lagrangian seems less than optimal, because it does not give a quadratic curvature term in $F_{\mu\nu}$. To obtain such a quadratic Lagrangian, the Lagrangian could instead be considered defined as

  $$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\kappa}L &= \mathrm{Re}\left(\langle \Omega^{\mu\nu}, \Omega_{\mu\nu}\rangle\right) \\ &= \mathrm{Re}\left(\langle K^{\mu\nu} + \mathrm{i}gF^{\mu\nu}, K_{\mu\nu} + \mathrm{i}gF_{\mu\nu}\rangle\right) \\ &= \mathrm{Re}\left(\langle K^{\mu\nu}, K_{\mu\nu}\rangle\right) - g^2F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned}$$

  where the last equality follows from the fact that $\langle x, y\rangle = 0$, for any $x \in \mathbb{C}\otimes\mathrm{Scal}(\mathbb{H})$ and $y \in \mathbb{C}\otimes\mathrm{Vec}(\mathbb{H})$. This Lagrangian, however, introduces the new entity $\mathrm{Re}\left(\langle K^{\mu\nu}, K_{\mu\nu}\rangle\right)$: whether or not it describes the gravitational force is as of yet completely unsettled.

Note added: As commented shortly after Eqs. (29)-(31) the covariant derivative of any (tensor-valued) quaternionic vector field V is invariant under a local $\mathrm{U}(1)$ gauge transformation. This is consistent with, and could have been anticipated from, the fact that $V' = \Lambda V \overline{\Lambda}^* = V$ for $\Lambda = \exp(\mathrm{i}\phi)$. In fact, local Lorentz transformations which obey $\overline{\Lambda} = \Lambda^{-1}$, a relation frequently used in this paper, and local $\mathrm{U}(1)$ gauge transformations $\Lambda = \exp(\mathrm{i}\phi)$ can be treated in the following unified manner:

- Local invariance of the metric, Eq. (5): The derivation holds also for a local $\mathrm{U}(1)$ gauge transformation, because $\left(\overline{\Lambda}\Lambda\right)^* = \left(\overline{\Lambda}\Lambda\right)^{-1}$ for $\Lambda = \exp(\mathrm{i}\phi)$.
- Transformation of the gauge connection, Eq. (12): If $\overline{\Lambda}$ is replaced by Λ^{-1}, thereby yielding

  $$\omega'_\mu = \Lambda \omega_\mu \Lambda^{-1} - (\partial_\mu \Lambda)\,\Lambda^{-1},$$

  then Propositions 1 and 2 apply to both local Lorentz transformations and local $\mathrm{U}(1)$ gauge transformations. Note that this modified expression for ω'_μ correctly reduces to Eq. (29) for $\Lambda = \exp(\mathrm{i}\phi)$.

7 Auxiliary material

7.1 Identities

The following Proposition lists some useful identities for composition algebras, a class to which the complexified quaternions belong, see for instance [7] or [8]. Note that the normalization of the inner products in [7] and [8], respectively, differ by a factor of 2. The normalization used in Eq. (1) is the normalization used in [7].

Proposition 3 *The following identities hold for any composition algebra:*

$$\langle x, y\rangle \equiv \langle y, x\rangle\,, \tag{32}$$

$$\langle x, y\rangle \equiv \langle \overline{x}, \overline{y}\rangle\,, \tag{33}$$

and

$$\langle x, yz\rangle \equiv \langle \overline{y}x, z\rangle\,, \tag{34}$$

$$\langle xy, z\rangle \equiv \langle x, z\overline{y}\rangle\,. \tag{35}$$

7.2 Various

Proposition 4 *Let* $x, y \in (\mathbb{C}\otimes\mathbb{H})^-$. *Then,* $\langle x, y\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof: Using $\overline{x}^* = -x$ and $\overline{y}^* = -y$:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle x, y\rangle^* &= (x\overline{y} + y\overline{x})^* \\ &= x^*\overline{y}^* + y^*\overline{x}^* \\ &= \overline{x}y + \overline{y}x \\ &= 2\langle x, y\rangle . \end{aligned}$$

■

References

[1] V. Fock and D. Ivanenko, Compt. Rend. **188**, 1470 (1929).

[2] H. Weyl, Zeits. f. Phys. **56**, 330 (1929).

[3] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology* (Wiley, New York, 1972), pp. 365-373.

[4] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields*, Vol. 1-3 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002), Sec. 31.A.

[5] M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz, and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987), Sec. 12.1.

[6] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1973).

[7] S. Okubo, *Introduction to Octonion and Other Non-Associative Algebras in Physics*, Montroll Memorial Lecture Series in Mathematical Physics, 2 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).

[8] T. A. Springer and F. D. Veldkamp, *Octonions, Jordan Algebras and Exceptional Groups* (Springer, Berlin, 2000).

[9] R. Dündarer and F. Gürsey, J. Math. Phys. **32**, 1176 (1991).

[10] J. Lambek, Mathematical Intelligencer **17**, 7 (1995).

[11] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **357**, 211 (1991).

[12] J. C. Baez, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **39**, 145 (2002).

[13] M. Günaydin and F. Gürsey, J. Math. Phys. **14**, 1651 (1973).